

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CARLOS RUIZ FLORES, :

Plaintiff, :

-against- :

88 ORCHARD COFFEE LLC, et al., :

Defendants. :

X

X

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 2/4/2020

19-CV-10176 (VSB)

**ORDER**

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

On November 1, 2019, Plaintiff filed this action against Defendants (Doc. 1.) Plaintiff obtained summonses on November 5, 2019. (Docs. 5, 6.) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an affidavit of service or taken any other action to prosecute this case. Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED that, no later than February 7, 2020, Plaintiff shall submit a letter of no more than three (3) pages, supported by legal authority, demonstrating good cause as to why this case should not be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). “Good cause is generally found only in exceptional circumstances where the plaintiff’s failure to serve process in a timely manner was the result of circumstances beyond its control.” *E. Refractories Co. v.*

*Forty Eight Insulations, Inc.*, 187 F.R.D. 503, 505 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) (internal quotation marks omitted). “District courts consider the diligence of plaintiff’s efforts to effect proper service and any prejudice suffered by the defendant as a consequence of the delay.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). “An attorney’s inadvertence, neglect, mistake or misplaced reliance does not constitute good cause.” *Howard v. Klynveld Peat Marwick Goerdeler*, 977 F.Supp. 654, 658 (S.D.N.Y.1997) (citing *McGregor v. United States*, 933 F.2d 156, 160 (2d Cir.1991), *aff’d*, 173 F.3d 844 (2d Cir.1999)). Plaintiff is warned that failure to submit a letter and to demonstrate

good cause for failure to serve Defendants within ninety days after the complaint was filed will result in dismissal of this action.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 4, 2020  
New York, New York

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vernon S. Broderick  
United States District Judge